arXiv:1612.09035v1 [physics.ins-det] 25 Dec 2016

Coherent Neutrino Scattering with Low Temperature Bolometers at Chooz Reactor Complex

J. Billard[1], R. Carr[2], J. Dawson[3], E. Figueroa-Feliciano[4], J. A. Formaggio[2], J. Gascon[1], M. De Jesus[1], J. Johnston[2], T. Lasserre[5,6], A. Leder[2], K. J. Palladino[7], S. H. Trowbridge[2], M. Vivier[5], and L. Winslow[2]

[1] *Univ Lyon, Universite Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS/IN2P3, Institut de Physique nucleaire de Lyon, 4 rue Enrico Fermi, F-69622 France*

[2] *Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA*

[3] *AstroParticule et Cosmologie, Universite Paris Diderot, Paris, France*

[4] *Department of Physics, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA*

[5] *Commissariat à l'énergie atomique et aux énergies alternatives, Centre de Saclay, DRF/Irfu, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France*

[6] *AstroParticule et Cosmologie, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, CEA/IRFU, Observatoire de Paris, Sorbonne Paris Cité, 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France*

[7] *Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA*

E-mail: `lwinslow@mit.edu`

30 December 2016

Abstract. We present the potential sensitivity of a future recoil detector for a first detection of the process of coherent elastic neutrino nucleus scattering (CEνNS). We use the Chooz reactor complex in France as our luminous source of reactor neutrinos. Leveraging the ability to cleanly separate the rate correlated with the reactor thermal power against (uncorrelated) backgrounds, we show that a 10 kilogram cryogenic bolometric array with 100 eV threshold should be able to extract a CEνNS signal within one year of running.

Keywords: neutrino coherent scattering, reactor neutrinos.
Submitted to: *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.*

1. Introduction

It has been almost four decades since the idea that neutrinos should be able to coherently scatter against the nucleus as a whole was originally proposed [1]. The condition for such coherence is typically met for neutrinos with energies $\lesssim$100 MeV. In this energy range, coherent elastic neutrino nucleus scattering (CEνNS) possesses a large cross-section on neutron rich targets when compared to other common detection channels such as inverse beta decay and neutrino electron scattering. Despite this clear enhancement, the CEνNS process has never been observed due to the difficulty in detecting the low-energy $\sim$0.1-10 keV nuclear recoil that marks its signature. A first detection of this process would be an important test of the Standard Model. Subsequent measurements could search for non-standard neutrino interactions [2] and sterile neutrinos [3]. The process also makes an excellent probe of the poorly constrained neutron density functions that dominate the calculation of the nuclear form function [4, 5], which is especially critical to understanding the production and detection of supernova neutrinos [6, 7, 8]. The physics implications are broad, from the physics of neutron stars to the neutrino floor for direct dark matter experiments [9]. Finally, observation of CEνNS has potential practical applications, since the process could also be used as a tool for nuclear reactor monitoring [10].

In order to meet the energy requirement for coherence, along with basic detection constraints of a sufficiently high flux and nuclear recoil energy, there are three possible sources of (anti)neutrinos that could be used to search for CEνNS: pion decay at rest beam (DAR), an intense radioactive source, and a nuclear reactor. The DAR source has the highest energy neutrinos and therefore the energy threshold needed to detect CEνNS has already been achieved in germanium, sodium and liquid argon-based detectors. The COHERENT experiment proposes to use the Spallation Neutron source as a DAR and a suite of two if not three of the above detector technologies [11]. TEXONO has a similar proposal for Ge-based detectors [12].

The program becomes more challenging if one is to detect CEνNS from a nuclear reactor or an intense radioactive source. The mean neutrino energy at a nuclear reactor such as Chooz is around 3.6 MeV with an endpoint near 10 MeV. Due to the lower neutrino energies, recoil detector technologies with sub-keV energy thresholds are required. cryogenic bolometers could be optimized to achieve such low energy thresholds, as advanced by the Ricochet experiment [3]. The CONNIE experiment proposes to achieve the needed threshold using charge coupled devices (CCDs) [13, 14]. As will be discussed below, metallic superconducting bolometers and Ge-based semiconductors can be used to achieve these low thresholds.

Maximizing the advantage provided by low threshold detectors and the high flux of commercial reactors could provide the ideal combination to make a definitive measurement of the CEνNS process. France's Chooz Nuclear Power Plant is a uniquely well-suited location for a reactor-based CEνNS search. Each of the site's twin reactors generates 4.3 GW of thermal power during standard operations, making them among

Table 1. The maximum recoil energy $T_{\max}$ for neutrinos with energies of 3 and 30 MeV and the minimum neutrino energy $E_\nu^{\min}$ for detector thresholds of 100 and 200 eV, for a variety of targets in consideration for CEνNS detection.

	$T_{\max}$		$E_\nu^{\min}$	
Target Nucleus	E_ν = 3 MeV	E_ν = 30 MeV	E_R=100 eV	E_R=200 eV
Ar	484 eV	48.3 keV	1.36 MeV	1.93 MeV
Ge	266 eV	26.6 keV	1.84 MeV	2.60 MeV
Zn	296 eV	29.5 keV	1.75 MeV	2.47 MeV

the most luminous reactor neutrino sources in the world [15]. The high neutrino flux makes it feasible to position a detector well outside the reactor containment buildings, eliminating the reactor-produced neutron and gamma backgrounds that challenge close-to-core measurements. At Chooz, a suitable laboratory already exists at a distance of 469 m and 355 m from the two reactor cores. In this lab, currently used by the Double Chooz near detector, a 140 m.w.e. overburden reduces the cosmic ray flux down to (3.74 ± 0.21) $\mu/\mathrm{m}^2/\mathrm{s}$ [16]. Comparing data collected when both reactors are operating to data collected during single-reactor refueling shutdowns will provide both a powerful background discriminant and a demonstration of CEνNS as a reactor monitoring tool.

We examine the sensitivity of a 10-kg bolometer-based detector located at the near site location of the Chooz Nuclear Power Plant. We show that, even assuming minimal knowledge of background rates, we can measure the CEνNS rate in the proposed detector to a precision of *at least* 35% after one year of running.

2. Low Threshold Cryogenic Detectors

The key for detecting the recoil signature of the CEνNS process is the ability to keep the recoil energy threshold for detection as low as possible. Unlike the spallation sources, a significant fraction of neutrinos created from the nuclear burning cycle reach only a few MeV in energy. In the approximation where the target mass (M_A) is much greater than the neutrino energy (E_ν), the maximum recoil energy imparted onto the target ($T_{\max}$) is given by the relation:

$$T_{\max} = \frac{E_\nu}{1 + \frac{M_A}{2E_\nu}}. \tag{1}$$

Table 2 shows the typical recoil energies characteristic from 3 and 30 MeV neutrinos on plausible CEνNS detector materials. It is clear that thresholds below 1 keV are a must for detection.

For the case presented here, we will primarily consider phonon detection of recoil events. The recoil energy for the detectors described here is determined by the thermal imprint of the neutrino-lattice recoil. In an ideal thermal detector, the total recoil energy deposited translates into a change in temperature that depends on the heat capacity of

the absorber. For a total recoil energy, $E_R \leq T_{\max}$, the change in temperature is given by

$$\Delta T = \frac{E_R}{C(T)} e^{-t/\tau} \qquad \tau = C(T)/G(T) \tag{2}$$

where $C(T)$ is the total heat capacity of the absorber, $G(T)$ is thermal conductance between the absorber to the thermal bath, T is the temperature, and t is time since the interaction. The minimum recoil threshold is determined by the mean energy fluctuations in the absorber, σ, which depends on both the heat capacity and the temperature of the absorber:

$$\sigma = \eta \sqrt{k_b T^2 C(T)} \tag{3}$$

where k_b is Boltzmann's constant, and η is a proportionality constant $\mathcal{O}(1)$. The heat capacity of the system receives contributions from a number of different sources. While for normal metals the electronic contribution of $C(T)$ is linear in recoil energy, this contribution is proportional to T^3 for dielectrics (such as Si and Ge), and proportional to e^{-T/T_c} for metallic superconductors (such as Zn and Os). In which case, only the lattice contribution remains:

$$C(T) = \frac{12\pi^4 N_A k_b}{5} \frac{m}{M} (\frac{T}{\Theta_D})^3 \quad [\text{J K}^{-1}] \tag{4}$$

where m is the mass of the absorber, N_A is Avodadro's number, M is the molecular weight, and Θ_D is the Debye temperature. For germanium (Θ_D = 375 K) and zinc (θ_D = 325 K, T_c = 0.855 K) crystals at sufficiently low temperatures and small enough mass, one can achieve a thermal noise sufficiently small to allow detection thresholds below 100 eV. In our case, we consider Ge- and Zn-based detectors with masses of order 30-50 grams operated around 15 mK. At such low temperatures, the fundamental thermal noise for these low mass detectors are 1.3 eV and 1.6 eV for Ge and Zn, respectively. This estimate assumes no contribution to the thermal capacitance from other sources, and thus represents an absolute lowest limit. For our signal estimates, we will assume an energy threshold of 50, 100, and 200 eV recoil energy thresholds. These thresholds are many-fold above this fundamental limit, and represent achievable target thresholds for the EDELWEISS experiment [17].

Ricochet leverages two low-temperature technologies in order to achieve the lowest achievable recoil threshold: Ge-based detectors, as developed by experiments such as EDELWEISS [17] and CDMS [18], and metallic superconductors. Both detector technologies exploit the potential separation between recoil and electromagnetic events for better background rejection. In the case of germanium detectors, nuclear recoils are identified by comparing a measured ionization signal against the $\sim$ μK rise in temperature accompanying each interaction. For the case of the metallic zinc detectors, the lifetime of quasi-particles created by electromagnetic interactions increases exponentially as the temperature drops below the critical temperature. This reduces the electronic noise contribution and changes the detector response profile between lattice

and electromagnetic interactions. As a result, the lattice interactions are expected to exhibit different time profiles compared to their electromagnetic counterparts, providing a potential discrimination tool between signal and background.

Leveraging these two different background rejection techniques within the same detector would give greater confidence for determining the detection of the CEνNS process. However, for this paper, we do not explicitly assume any specific background rejection technique, but rather consider the potential of identifying a signal correlated with reactor power against an uncorrelated background. As will be shown, by simply taking advantage of the strong correlation between the signal events and the thermal nuclear power, one may cleanly extract a neutrino-induced signal even in the presence of high levels of detector backgrounds.

3. Neutrino Signal from Chooz

The Chooz reactor complex in Chooz, France provides an optimal setting for a first detection of the CEνNS process. The complex comprises two commercial nuclear reactors of the same design with a combined thermal power of 8.54 GW. We imagine placement of a combined 10-kg payload at the site of the Double Chooz experiment's near detector, which is located 355.39 m and 468.76 m away from the two reactor cores. For the calculation of the flux, we assume the neutrino spectrum as calculated by [19] for ^{235}U,^{239}Pu, and ^{241}Pu, and [20] to calculate the ^{238}U spectrum. For this study, we assume the fraction of the four isotopes are (^{235}U:^{239}Pu:^{241}Pu:^{238}U = 55.6%:32.6%:7.1%:4.7%)[21]. Such particular combination is representative of typical conditions of the Chooz reactor. Changes over reactor cycle have negligible impact on rates and are ignored for this study. We approximate the neutrino energy spectrum as constant below 2 MeV, since the phenomenological approximation used to determine the neutrino flux are typically not reported below this energy.

The CEνNS cross-section for a target nucleus (A) as a function of its recoil energy E_R is given by the expression:

$$\frac{d\sigma(\nu A \rightarrow \nu A)}{dE_R} = \frac{G_F^2}{4\pi} M_A Q_W^2 (1 - \frac{M_A E_R}{2E_\nu^2}) F(q^2)^2 \tag{5}$$

where G_F is the Fermi coupling constant, M_A is the mass of the nucleus, $F(q^2)$ is the nuclear form factor [5], $Q_W = N - Z(1 - 4\sin^2\theta_W)$ is the weak charge, and $N(Z)$ represents the number of neutrons (protons) in the nucleus. Due to the Weinberg angle suppression, the process scales primarily with the number of neutrons, squared.

Figure 1 shows the differential rate for the predicted neutrino signal versus detected recoil energy. By integrating above a certain threshold, we can determine the total event rates (Table 2). For a 10-kg payload equally divided into Ge- and Zn based detectors, we would expect $\sim$ 4.85 events/day with a 100 eV recoil threshold and full reactor power. This rate increases by almost 50% if the threshold drops to 50 eV, placing a high premium on the detector threshold one can achieve.

Detector Threshold	Rate (per kg per day) Si	Zn	Ge	Os
50 eV	0.32	0.66	0.76	1.25
100 eV	0.26	0.46	0.51	0.55
200 eV	0.19	0.25	0.26	0.14

Table 2. The predicted CEνNS event rate for various detector materials and recoil threshold energies. Rates are calculated for a reactor power of 8.54 GW, a detector distance of 400 m, and fission fractions ^{235}U = 55.6%, ^{239}Pu= 32.6%,^{241}Pu = 7.1%, and ^{238}U = 4.7%.



Figure 1. Differential CEνNS rate and select background rates versus detector recoil energy.

4. Background Estimates

Placement of the Ricochet experiment at the Chooz near reactor site –over 400 meters of rock and soil separating the detector from the reactor cores– has the unique advantage in that it reduces the reactor-correlated neutron and gamma backgrounds to undetectable levels. This allows for a clean separation of "neutrino-induced events", which are correlated with the reactor thermal power, and "background events", which are uncorrelated with the reactor activity. Such leverage has already been used by the Double Chooz collaboration with great success in its measurement of the neutrino-induced inverse beta decay process for the purposes of extracting the neutrino mixing angle θ_{13} [22, 23]. To help determine Ricochet's sensitivity to the CEνNS reaction, we will first provide an estimate of the uncorrelated background, as shown below.

4.1. External Neutrons



Figure 2. The estimated cosmogenically activated (dashed line) and (α, n) (solid line) input neutron energy spectra at the near hall of the Chooz reactor complex, normalized to unity. The (α, n) spectra represents a volume source whose boundaries surround the detector, while the cosmogenic spectrum represents a surface source surrounding the detector area. The cosmogenic spectrum is taken from Ref. [24].

The (α, n) background represents the neutrons created from the naturally occurring uranium and thorium decay chains interacting with the various elements in the surrounding cavern. These reactions tend to produce neutrons with kinetic energies below 10 MeV. Combining existing measurements of the rock composition at the Chooz site [25] and simulations of the U/Th decay spectra (using GEANT4 [26]), we are able to model the neutron spectrum from (α, n) reactions, which is expected to be below 10^{-7} events/eV/kg/day, well below other contributions.

A similar procedure is used to assess the neutron background due to cosmogenic activity surrounding the Chooz cavern. Neutrons from cosmogenic activation tend to possess much higher energies (limit closer to $\leq$ 100 GeV), and pose a more serious background source (see Figure 2). The initial neutron energy spectrum is assumed to follow the shape outlined in Mei and Hime [24]. Both the (α, n) and cosmogenic neutron spectra are propagated through a GEANT4 simulation of both the Chooz detector [27] and a future Ricochet experiment. The Double Chooz measured neutron rate of 3.42 ± 0.23 day^{-1} (captured in Gd-target volume with minimal analysis cuts and with a reconstructed energy between 0.5 and 20.0 MeV) at the near hall serves as a normalization constraint to the simulation [28]. The equivalent background rate from this source for a Ricochet-style detector utilizing the preexisting Double Chooz water shielding as a veto system is projected to be $(1.1 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-4}$ neutrons/kg/eV/day,

leading to a total rate of 0.10±0.1 neutrons/kg/day for recoil energy depositions between 0.1 and 1 keV.

4.2. Internal Radioactivity



Figure 3. The differential event rate of the internal backgrounds of a Ge detector as observed by the EDELWEISS-III experiment [29]: gamma + tritium (red solid line), beta (blue dotted line) and ^{206}Pb(green dot-dashed line), in ionization energy (left panel) and recoil energy (right panel).

The internal backgrounds for the Ricochet experiment will be assumed to be similar in magnitude and shape to the ones observed by the EDELWEISS-III dark matter direct detection experiment [29] as the material screening and selection will follow the same level of radiopurity [30]. Figure 3 presents the low energy contributions of the different internal backgrounds as observed by the EDELWEISS-III experiment which will be used hereafter for the Ricochet sensitivity estimates. The gamma background (red solid line) is explained by the Compton component from radiogenic gammas and the cosmogenic activation of the Ge crystal leading to EC-lines (10 keV K-shell, 1.3 keV L-shell, 160 eV M-shell) and tritium beta decay with an endpoint of 18.6 keV [31]. These backgrounds can be kept at a minimal level by maximally reducing the exposure of the detectors to the surface to prevent cosmogenic activation. Surface contamination from ^{222}Rn leads to the ^{210}Pb decay chain, characterized by a 22.3 years of half-life, that undergo beta decays (blue dotted line), alphas and ^{206}Pb nuclear recoils (green dashed line). These backgrounds require working under radon-free air combined with efficient chemical etching of copper [32]. Radiogenic neutrons are not shown here as they are negligible compared to cosmogenic and rock-induced neutrons as discussed above [29]

The one long-lived contribution that would not be present in the EDELWEISS germanium detectors that is difficult to extrapolate directly to the zinc absorbers is the

cosmogenic activation of ^{65}Zn ($\tau_{1/2} = 243$ days), which has both a β-decay channel as well as a low energy meta-stable state (^{65m}Zn, with emission at 53 keV).

Of note, the isotopes of ^{64}Zn, ^{70}Zn, and ^{76}Ge undergo $\beta\beta$-decay, but due to the large lower bounds on their half lives calculated in [33, 34] and large endpoint energies on the order of 1 MeV, we will detect less than 0.01 events/kg/day in our region of interest.

Table 3. A summary of correlated and uncorrelated backgrounds to reactor power on a 5 kg Ge + 5 kg Zn recoil detector located at the Chooz near site underground hall. The region of interest (ROI) is defined between 100 eV and 1 keV. The tritium estimate† on differential rate includes only beta-spectrum contribution, while total rate estimate also includes γ line contributions as well.

Background Source	Rate ($\mathrm{kg^{-1}day^{-1}eV^{-1}}$)	Total Rate in ROI (events/day)
Uncorrelated Rate		
Fast Neutrons	$(1.1 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-4}$	1.0 ± 0.1
(α, n)	$< 1.1 \times 10^{-5}$	< 0.1
β decays from ^{210}Pb	$(9.8 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-4}$	8.8 ± 2.8
^{3}H†	$(2.8 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-4}$	3.7 ± 1.0
^{206}Pb	$(2.2 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-5}$	0.2 ± 0.1
^{70}Zn$\beta^-\beta^-$	$(3.9 \pm 7.0) \times 10^{-5}$	< 0.1
^{64}Zn$\beta^+\beta^+$	$(1.3 \pm 3.9) \times 10^{-6}$	< 0.1
^{76}Ge$\beta^-\beta^-$	$(4.0 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-8}$	< 0.1
Total Uncorrelated Rate		13.7 ± 3.0
Correlated Flux Rate		
CEνNS		4.85
$\bar{\nu}_e e^-$-scattering		0.15
Total Correlated Rate		5.00 ± 0.25

4.3. Neutrino-Induced Background

As the extracted CEνNS rate would be determined from its correlation with the reactor power, a rate-based analysis would not be able to discern between coherent and incoherent interaction channels. The rate from $\bar{\nu}_e + e^-$ elastic scattering can be readily calculated, and is expected to yield ~ 0.015 events/kg/day, a mere 3% of the total neutrino signal. Charged current interactions of $\bar{\nu}_e$ on zinc and germanium isotopes are limited because their thresholds are typically several MeV, and are expected to yield ~ 0.004 events/kg/day in Zn and ~ 0.001 events/kg/day in Ge.

Table 4. Estimated sensitivity of the proposed detector to a CEvNS signal, for several possible background rates, run times, and reactor power conditions. Sensitivity is defined as the expected 1σ uncertainty on the signal rate divided by the signal rate. The input signal rate is assumed to be ~ 5 events per day at full reactor power.

Background (events/day in ROI)	Run Time (years)	Sensitivity (Rate Only, 80% Full)	Sensitivity (Rate Only, 60% Full)	Sensitivity (Rate Only, 58% Full, 2% Off)	Sensitivity (Rate + Shape, 60% Full)
14	1	23%	19%	14%	3.7%
14	5	10%	8%	8%	1.8%
36	1	34%	26%	16%	4.8%
36	5	15%	12%	12%	2.2%
50	1	34%	31%	26%	5.3%
50	5	18%	14%	13%	2.6%

5. Sensitivity

The strong suppression of the neutron background from the reactor core allows us to fit the data with with just two parameters: a reactor-correlated neutrino signal and a background that is uncorrelated with the reactor power output. Although both the signal and background might posses subtle time structure due to the decay times of various isotopes, those should be sub-dominant to the correlation with the reactor power. We perform two separate analyses; a *conservative* rate-only analysis, which looks at the integrated rate as a function of time, and a *best-case* analysis using both rate and shape, where the spectral information for the CEνNS reaction is included in the signal extraction. For a given signal rate S and background B, the likelihood can be reconstructed from the combined probability of seeing a rate $\mathbf{N^{obs}}$:

$$\mathcal{L}(S, B) = \mathcal{P}(S, B|\mathbf{N^{obs}}). \tag{6}$$

The number of observed events is reconstructed as a function of time and/or recoil energy, depending on the analysis. The likelihood is reconstructed from pseudo-data and compared against either a background-only model or one which includes a signal correlated in time with the reactor thermal power. In both analyses, we make use of the Stan modeling language in order to assess the sensitivity of such a future measurement [35].

We assume that the time structure and energy profile of the background is flat, while that of the neutrino is tied solely to the power output from the two reactor cores. Assuming, based on the average operating profile at the Chooz plant, that 40% of the time one of the two reactors (B1 or B2, but not both) is off-line, we are able to extract the fraction of the signal that is correlated with the reactor flux [23]. We also explore the case where 20% of the time one of the two reactors (B1 or B2, but not both) is off-line



Figure 4. The 90% C.L. limit extracted in the case of zero input signal using a rate only (solid) and rate+shape (dashed) analyses. The extracted limits are well below the expected 5 events/day expected from the Ricochet 10 kg target, assuming a 100 eV recoil energy threshold.

and for the case when *both* reactors are offline for 2% of the run cycle. In our analysis, we assume a total ±5% systematic uncertainty in the signal rate, which we attribute to uncertainties associated with maintaining a fixed energy threshold over time and daily variations in the thermal reactor flux, and thus is uncorrelated between different time bins in the analysis.

Table 4 shows the ability to extract the neutrino CEνNS signal under different assumptions for the background level. Indeed, even under conditions of small signal-to-background ratios a strong neutrino signal can be extracted in a relatively small time scale (see Fig. 5). By simulating the case where no signal is present, it is also possible to extract a lower limit on the signal a future Ricochet detector could detect. The 90% confidence level of that lower signal limit is presented in Figure 4.

6. Conclusion

The combination of a luminous neutrino source and effective overburden makes bolometric detection of the CEνNS process extremely attractive at a location such as Chooz. We have shown that even for a modest signal-to-noise ratio, a CEνNS signal can be extracted with reasonable confidence, thanks to the leverage imparted from



Figure 5. Simulated reactor power, simulated data, and the extracted signal for a background of 14 events/day and a signal of 5.0 evts/day. The reactor is modeled at full power 60% of the time and half power for 40%.

being able to cleanly distinguish neutrino signals from uncorrelated backgrounds. We hope a demonstration of this technique will open the door to the myriad of scientific opportunities available from coherent neutrino scattering.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the Heising-Simons Foundation for their generous support of the work presented here.

References

[1] Freedman D Z 1974 *Phys. Rev.* **D9** 1389–1392
[2] Scholberg K 2006 *Phys. Rev.* **D73** 033005 (*Preprint* `hep-ex/0511042`)
[3] Formaggio J A, Figueroa-Feliciano E and Anderson A J 2012 *Phys. Rev.* **D85** 013009 (*Preprint* `1107.3512`)
[4] Patton K, Engel J, McLaughlin G C and Schunck N 2012 *Phys. Rev.* **C86** 024612 (*Preprint* `1207.0693`)
[5] McLaughlin G 2015 *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1666** 160001
[6] Wilson J R 1974 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** 849–852
[7] Horowitz C J, Perez-Garcia M A, Carriere J, Berry D K and Piekarewicz J 2004 *Phys. Rev.* **C70** 065806 (*Preprint* `astro-ph/0409296`)

[8] Scholberg K 2012 *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **62** 81–103 (*Preprint* 1205.6003)
[9] Billard J, Strigari L and Figueroa-Feliciano E 2014 *Phys. Rev.* **D89** 023524 (*Preprint* 1307.5458)
[10] Christensen E, Huber P, Jaffke P and Shea T E 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** 042503 (*Preprint* 1403.7065)
[11] Akimov D *et al.* (COHERENT) 2015 (*Preprint* 1509.08702)
[12] Kerman S, Sharma V, Deniz M, Wong H T, Chen J W, Li H B, Lin S T, Liu C P and Yue Q (TEXONO) 2016 *Phys. Rev.* **D93** 113006 (*Preprint* 1603.08786)
[13] Fernandez Moroni G, Estrada J, Paolini E E, Cancelo G, Tiffenberg J and Molina J 2015 *Phys. Rev.* **D91** 072001 (*Preprint* 1405.5761)
[14] Aguilar-Arevalo A *et al.* (CONNIE) 2016 *JINST* **11** P07024 (*Preprint* 1604.01343)
[15] Ardellier F *et al.* (Double Chooz) 2006 (*Preprint* hep-ex/0606025)
[16] Dietrich D 2013 *Studying the Muon Background Component in the Double Chooz Experiment* Ph.D. thesis University of Tübingen
[17] Armengaud E *et al.* (EDELWEISS) 2016 *JCAP* **1605** 019 (*Preprint* 1603.05120)
[18] Agnese R *et al.* (SuperCDMS) 2016 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** 071301 (*Preprint* 1509.02448)
[19] Huber P 2011 *Phys. Rev. C* **84**(2) 024617
[20] Mueller T A, Lhuillier D, Fallot M, Letourneau A, Cormon S, Fechner M, Giot L, Lasserre T, Martino J, Mention G, Porta A and Yermia F 2011 *Phys. Rev. C* **83**(5) 054615
[21] Ardellier F *et al.* 2004 (*Preprint* hep-ex/0405032)
[22] Abe Y *et al.* (Double Chooz) 2014 *JHEP* **10** 086 [Erratum: JHEP02,074(2015)] (*Preprint* 1406.7763)
[23] Abe Y *et al.* (Double Chooz) 2013 *Phys. Rev.* **D87** 011102 (*Preprint* 1210.3748)
[24] Mei D M and Hime A 2006 *Physical Review D - Particles, Fields, Gravitation and Cosmology* **73** 1–18 ISSN 15507998 (*Preprint* 0512125)
[25] Tang A, Horton-Smith G, Kudryavtsev V A and Tonazzo A 2006 *Physical Review D - Particles, Fields, Gravitation and Cosmology* **74** 1–14 ISSN 15507998 (*Preprint* 0604078v2)
[26] Agostinelli S *et al.* 2003 *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **506** 250 – 303 ISSN 0168-9002
[27] Junqueira de Castro Bezerra T 2015 *Double Chooz and Reactor Neutrino Oscillation* ISBN 978-4-431-55374-8
[28] Ishitsuka M 2016 New results of double chooz 51st Rencontres de Moriond URL https://indico.in2p3.fr/event/12279/session/3/contribution/173/material/slides/0.pdf
[29] Hehn L *et al.* (EDELWEISS) 2016 (*Preprint* 1607.03367)
[30] S S *et al.* (EDELWEISS) 2015 *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1672** 100002
[31] Armengaud E *et al.* (EDELWEISS) 2016 (*Preprint* 1607.04560)
[32] G Z and M W (EDELWEISS) 2012 *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **676** 140
[33] Belli P, Bernabei R, Cappella F, Cerulli R, Danevich F, Grinyov B, Incicchitti A, Kobychev V, Mokina V, Nagorny S, Nagornaya L, Nisi S, Nozzoli F, Poda D, Prosperi D, Tretyak V and Yurchenko S 2009 *Nuclear Physics A* **826** 256 – 273 ISSN 0375-9474
[34] Barabash A 2015 *Physics Procedia* **74** 416 – 422 ISSN 1875-3892
[35] Stan Development Team 2015 Stan: A c++ library for probability and sampling, version 2.10.0 URL http://mc-stan.org/